

Department of the Navy The BRAC 1993 Process

The Secretary of the Navy established a Base Structure Evaluation Committee, responsible for preparing recommendations for closure or realignment of Naval installations. The Committee was tasked to develop categories of installations; determine whether excess capacity exists, and develop methodologies to reduce it. The Committee was responsible for evaluating return on investment, economic and community impacts, and for developing recommendations for closure or realignment to the Secretary of the Navy.

The Committee was supported by the Base Structure Analysis Team which developed data calls, recommended analytical methodologies and maintained the Base Structure Data Base. The Analysis Team developed the Navy's Internal Control Plan which specified organizational and documentation controls for managing the process. A key element of the Internal Control Plan was the involvement of the Naval Audit Service. The Audit Service served as a technical advisor to the Committee, validating the procedures used to build the database and auditing data to determine the method of collection, its accuracy, and the level of compliance throughout the chain of command. The Internal Control Plan also established the procedures necessary to create an audit trail to document the Navy process. One of the most significant controls was the requirement to keep minutes of each deliberative meeting of the Committee.

In accordance with PL 101-510, as amended, the Navy employed a "bottom to top" data certification policy. That meant that the individual initially generating the data in response to a data call, executed the initial statutory certification and, thereafter, the data was recertified at each succeeding level of the chain of command before the data was provided to the Committee for inclusion in the database. The Navy's Audit Service and its General Counsel ensured compliance.

The Committee determined that installations fell into three categories: (1) providing support to military personnel (personnel); (2) providing weapon systems and material support (materials); and (3) providing shore support to Navy and Marine Corps operational forces (forces). Within these three categories, activities were grouped into a variety of subcategories. Several of these subcategories were divided into further sub-elements for purposes of analysis. Within these subcategories are the individual Navy or Marine Corps installations reviewed by the Committee.

At least two data calls were sent to each *installation*; one for data relating to capacity and the other for data relating *to* military value. These data calls were prepared by the Analysis Team with the assistance of technical experts in the various disciplines and approved by the Committee. The responses *to* the data calls, having been properly certified, were entered into the database and formed the sole basis for the Committee's recommendations.

The next step was to determine whether there was excess capacity in any given subcategory, and if so, *to* what extent. If there was no meaningful excess capacity in a

subcategory, no installation in that subcategory was considered further for closure or realignment. If, on the other hand, a subcategory had sufficient excess capacity, the Committee evaluated the military value of each *installation* in the subcategory.

The capacity analysis used the certified data call responses to develop throughputs as the basic indicator of capacity. For example, the key indicator for training centers was the average number of students on board. Similarly, for operational air stations, the basic throughput indicator was the number of squadrons that could be hosted in terms of apron space, hangers and runways. A comparison was made between the maximum available throughput and that required by the DoD Force Structure Plan. When the available throughput exceeded the force structure requirement, the Committee determined there was excess capacity. In subcategories in which there was either no or minimal excess capacity, the Committee determined that further analysis for military value was not warranted.

Whenever the capacity analysis indicated the presence of more than minimal excess capacity within a particular subcategory, each installation in that subcategory was subjected to a military value analysis. The Committee categorized the four DoD military value criteria as readiness, facilities, mobilization capability, and cost and manpower implications. For each of the four major categories of military value, the Committee assigned a weight so that the sum of the weights equaled 100, and these weights were applied to the military value analyses for each installation in the subcategories within that category.

The Analysis Team prepared a series of questions or statements which the Committee placed in one of three scoring bands depending on their level of importance. Each question or statement was then given a numerical scoring range, by the Committee, depending on the band in which it was placed (i.e., Band 1: 6-10 points; Band 2: 3-7 points; Band 3: 1-4 points). The Committee reviewed the responses from each installation within that subcategory. If the response contained data which affirmatively answered the subject matter, that installation received the weighted point total for that question. The total point score for each installation was determined by simple addition of the weighted-average points received.

The next step was to develop closure and realignment scenarios with the use of a computer model. The goal of the model was to find that set of installations in a subcategory which achieved the maximum reduction of excess capacity and, to the maximum extent practicable, resulted in an average military value equal to or greater than all installations currently in that subcategory.

Not all scenarios were limited to installations in a single subcategory. For instance, in the case of naval bases, berthing of ships was the prime throughput indicia for analysis. Since the Naval Air Station, Alameda, is the homeport for two aircraft carriers, it was also considered in the configuration analysis of the "naval bases" subcategory along with installations such as Naval Base, Norfolk.

Rules for the computer model were developed so that the model would not run unconstrained. For example, left to run without guidance, the model might identify a set of bases which eliminated excess capacity but which bore little resemblance to operational realities. Therefore, the model was given some rules, which, in the case of naval bases for example, included the rule that ships were to be split between the Atlantic and Pacific Fleets

in the ratios reflected in the Fiscal Year 1994 - 1995 President's Budget Submission. In every case where rules were imposed, the Committee reviewed them stringently to ensure that only the minimum number of rules needed to operate the model were prescribed so the results would not be artificially skewed.

The computer model resulted in finding that mix of installations which resulted in the maximum reduction of excess capacity without regard to the installation's military value. If that mix resulted in an average military value which was less than that for the current list of installations, the computer was asked to search for an alternative mix which raised the average military value with the minimum decrease in the reduction of excess capacity.

The computer models were the starting point for the application of military judgment in the analysis of potential closure or realignment scenarios. For example, in the configuration analysis for naval bases, the model satisfied its requirement to reduce capacity by identifying as excess the capacity at both of the Naval Station and the Submarine Base at Pearl Harbor. The Committee determined that, as a matter of naval presence in the Pacific theater, it was more important for military value to retain the forward capability in the Pacific than to achieve an absolute maximum reduction in excess capacity.

Sometimes the configuration analysis was not helpful. In the case of the two Marine Corps training bases, the two logistics bases, and the two recruit depots there is insufficient capacity in any one of those facilities to handle the requirements flowing from the DoD Force Structure Plan should the other be closed. In those instances, the Committee determined that further analysis was unwarranted.

Finally, the Committee evaluated the potential costs and savings, economic impact, community infrastructure and environmental impact on closure and realignment candidates (and any potential receiving locations) before making its nominations to the Acting Secretary of the Navy. .

The Chief of Naval Operations, in his capacity as Acting Secretary of the Navy, with the advice of the Commandant of the Marine Corps, nominated bases to the Secretary of Defense for closure or realignment based on the force structure plan and the final criteria established under Public Law 101-510, as amended. After the Base Closure and Realignment Commission acted, the following Navy and Marine Corps bases were recommended for closure or realignment:

Naval Bases/Stations

Naval Education and Training Center, Newport, Rhode Island (ship berthing and maintenance activity)
Naval Station, Staten Island, New York
Naval Station, Charleston, South Carolina (recommendation modified to retain as needed to support NESEC consolidation in Charleston)
Naval Station, Mobile, Alabama
Naval Station Treasure Island, San Francisco, California

Naval Supply Centers

Naval Supply Center, Charleston, South Carolina (recommendation modified to retain as needed to support NESEC consolidation in Charleston)
Naval Supply Center, Pensacola, Florida

Naval Aviation Depots

Naval Aviation Depot, Alameda, California
Naval Aviation Depot, Pensacola, Florida (recommendation modified to total closure, rather than retention of some facilities)
Naval Aviation Depot, Norfolk, Virginia

Naval Shipyards

Naval Shipyard, Charleston, South Carolina (recommendation modified to retain as needed to support NESEC consolidation in Charleston)
Mare Island Naval Shipyard, Vallejo, California

Reserve Air Stations/Facilities

Naval Air Station, Glenview, Illinois
Naval Air Facility, Detroit, Michigan
Naval Air Station, Dallas, Texas
Naval Air Facility, Martinsburg, West Virginia
Navy/Marine Corps Air Facility, Johnston, Pennsylvania

Naval Training Centers

Naval Training Center, San Diego, California
Naval Training Center, Orlando, Florida

Operational Air Stations

Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, Jacksonville, Florida
Naval Air Station, Barbers Point, Hawaii
Naval Air Station, Agana, Guam
Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, California
Naval Air Station, Alameda, California

Naval Telecommunications Activities

Naval Radio Transmitting Facility, Annapolis, Maryland
Naval Radio Transmitting Facility, Driver, Virginia

Naval Technical Centers

Naval Electronic Systems Engineering Centers (modified recommendations to consolidate NESECs at Charleston, vice Portsmouth)
Naval Electronic Systems Engineering Center, Charleston, South Carolina
Naval Electronic Systems Engineering Center, St. Inigoes, Maryland
Naval Electronic Systems Engineering Center, Portsmouth, Virginia
Naval Electronic Security Systems Engineering Center, Washington, D.C.

Naval Surface Warfare Center-Dahlgren, White Oak Detachment, Silver Spring, Maryland
Naval Surface Warfare Center-Port Hueneme, Virginia Beach Detachment, Virginia Beach, Virginia
Naval Air Warfare Center-Aircraft Division, Trenton, New Jersey
Naval Undersea Warfare Center, Norfolk Detachment, Norfolk, Virginia
Naval Civil Engineering Laboratory, Port Hueneme, California

Planning, Engineering for Repair and Alterations (PERA) Activities

Planning, Engineering for Repair, and Alterations (CV), Bremerton, Washington
Planning, Engineering for Repair, and Alterations (Surface) - Atlantic, Norfolk, Virginia
Planning, Engineering for Repair and Alterations (Surface) - Pacific, San Francisco, CA
Planning, Engineering for Repair, and Alterations (Surface) (HQ), Philadelphia, PA
Sea Automated Data Systems Activity, Indian Head, Maryland
Submarine Maintenance, Engineering, Planning and Procurement (SUBMEPP), Portsmouth, New Hampshire

National Capital Region (NCR) Activities

Naval Air Systems Command, Arlington, Virginia
Naval Supply Systems Command, Washington, D.C.
Bureau of Naval Personnel, Arlington, Virginia
Naval Recruiting Command, Arlington, Virginia
Naval Security Group Command, Washington, D.C.
Tactical Support Activity, Washington, D.C. and Silver Spring (White Oak), Maryland
Other DON NCR activities relocate from leased to government-owned space

Miscellaneous Other Support Activities

DoD Family Housing and Family Housing Office, Niagara Falls, New York
Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Western Engineering Field Division, San Bruno, California

Navy and Marine Corps Reserve Centers

Navy/Marine Corps Reserve Centers at
Abilene, Texas
Fort Wayne, Indiana
Lawrence, Massachusetts
Naval Reserve Centers at
Great Falls, Montana
Missoula, Montana
Gadsden, Alabama
Memphis, Tennessee
Terre Haute, Indiana
Atlantic City, New Jersey
Montgomery, Alabama
Poughkeepsie, New York
Fayetteville, Arkansas
Macon, Georgia
Fort Smith, Arkansas
Jamestown, New York
Parkersburg, West Virginia
Staunton, Virginia
Kingsport, Tennessee
Joplin, Missouri
Pacific Grove, California
Perth Amboy, New Jersey
Altoona, Pennsylvania
Pittsfield, Massachusetts

Monroe, Louisiana
Hutchinson, Kansas
New Bedford, Massachusetts
St. Joseph, Missouri
Ogden, Utah
Chicopee, Massachusetts
Quincy, Massachusetts
Naval Reserve Facilities at
 Alexandria, Louisiana
 Midland, Texas
Naval Reserve Readiness Commands at:
 Scotia, New York (REDCOM 2)
 Ravenna, Ohio (REDCOM 5)
 Olathe, Kansas (REDCOM 18)
[plus tenant Navy and Marine Corps Reserve Centers at closing bases]

Naval Hospitals

Naval Hospital, Orlando, Florida
Naval Hospital, Oakland, California

Public Works Centers

Public Works Center, San Francisco, California

Training Air Stations

Naval Air Station, Memphis, Tennessee

BRAC-91 Changes

Hunter Point Annex to Naval Station, Treasure Island, San Francisco, California
Naval Weapons Evaluation Facility, Albuquerque, New Mexico
Naval Electronic Systems Engineering Center, San Diego, California
Naval Mine Warfare Engineering Activity, Yorktown, Virginia (now Naval Surface Warfare Center-Port
 Hueneme, Yorktown Detachment)
Naval Air Facility, Midway Island
Marine Corps Air Station, Tustin, California (modified recommendation to include North Island as possible
 receiving site)

Other Commission Recommendations

Naval Weapons Station, Seal Beach, California (by decision on Letterkenny Army Depot, tactical missile
 workload will be consolidated at Letterkenny)

Marine Corps Logistics Base, Barstow, California (by decision on Letterkenny Army Depot, tactical
 missile workload will be consolidated at Letterkenny)